

PROJECT 10073 RECORD CARD

1. DATE 21-22 Mar 58	2. LOCATION Seaside Park, N.J.	12. CONCLUSIONS <input type="checkbox"/> Was Balloon <input type="checkbox"/> Probably Balloon <input type="checkbox"/> Possibly Balloon <input type="checkbox"/> Was Aircraft <input type="checkbox"/> Probably Aircraft <input type="checkbox"/> Possibly Aircraft <input type="checkbox"/> Was Astronomical <input type="checkbox"/> Probably Astronomical <input type="checkbox"/> Possibly Astronomical <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Data for Evaluation <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown
3. DATE-TIME GROUP Local _____ GMT 21-22/0945Z	4. TYPE OF OBSERVATION <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ground-Visual <input type="checkbox"/> Ground-Radar <input type="checkbox"/> Air-Visual <input type="checkbox"/> Air-Intercept Radar	
5. PHOTOS <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	6. SOURCE Civilian	
7. LENGTH OF OBSERVATION 3-4 mins	8. NUMBER OF OBJECTS One	9. COURSE ENE
10. BRIEF SUMMARY OF SIGHTING Elliptical obj, size of large grapefruit. Length approx 2 times as long. White to yellow light reflected on water. Steady slow course fm over water toward land. Disappeared prior to arrival over land. Two rpts, same time succeeding days. Different observers.		11. COMMENTS Astro plot & computer indicate the star Vega was practically in position given by observers. At point of initial observation, Venus was exceptionally bright, however location near 60 deg & lower. Investigators considered possible a/c sighting. Insufficient data. Terminal point of observation not included. Duration too short for Astro sighting at this elev.

O S00231 YDD038 TYD028 TMA124 TTE02 CJA052

PP RJEPMQ RJEPMB RJEPNY RJEDDN RJE DSD

DE RJEPMR 43A

P 2417Z02

FM COMDE 539TH FIS

TO RJEDDN/COMDR ADC

RJEPNY/COMDR 26ADIV

RJEDSO/COMDR AIR TECH INT CNTR

RJEPHQ/ASST CHIEF OF STAFF INTELL HQ USAF

RJEPHQ/OFFICE OF INFO SERV HQ USAF

INFO RJEPMB/CMMDR EADEF

ZEN/COMDR NY AIR DEF SECTOR

BT

/UNCLAS/539FIS 0127 INT. ATTN: CIC: SUBJECT UFO.

1. DESCRIPTION:

A. ELLIPTICAL

B. DIAMETER OF LARGE GRAPEFRUIT; LENGTH APPROXIMATELY TWO TIMES AS LONG.

C. WHITE TO LIGHT YELLOW (REFLECTED ON WATER)

D. ONE

E. N/A

F. NONE

G. NONE

H. NONE HEARD. OBSERVER MADE LITTLE EFFORT TO LISTEN FOR SOUNDS.

I. NONE

2. DESCRIPTION OF COURSE

A. SIZE OF BRIGHT OBJECT

B. ELEVATION - ~~260 DEGREES~~, AZIMUTH ~~060 DEGREES~~

C. OBSERVERS COULD NOT ESTIMATE

D. STEADY APPARENTLY ~~SLOW~~ COURSE FROM OVER WATER TOWARDS LAND.

E. DISAPPEARED BEFORE TO AERIAL OVER LAND

ATIC

POSS VELLOS R

? /

3/194

10/2

observers apparently want
too difficult about the
sighting at the time.

Asian Computer
VIA

lens
for

lens
for

3. MANNER OF OBSERVATION

- A. GROUND VISUAL
- B. NONE
- C. N/A

4. TIME & DATE OF SIGHTING

A. 21-22/0945Z MARCH (SIGHTED TWO DIFFERENT DAYS) SAME TIME
AND PLACE. 0945 - 5 = 0945 -

- B. NIGHT

5. BOTH SIGHTINGS MADE FROM SEASIDE PARK, NEW JERSEY

6. IDENTIFYING INFO OF ALL OBSERVERS

A. FIRST SIGHTING

PATROLMAN J. CASTOR-52

120 "L" STREET, SEASIDE PARK, NEW JERSEY

LOCAL POLICEMAN

SECOND SIGHTING

PATROLMAN ANDERSON -29

120 5TH AVENUE, SEASIDE PARK, NEW JERSEY

LOCAL POLICEMAN

PATROLMAN LEE-52

SEASIDE HEIGHTS, NEW JERSEY

LOCAL POLICEMAN

PATROLMAN S. BREATHWEIGHT -60

WEBSTER AVENUE, SEASIDE HEIGHTS, NEW JERSEY

LOCAL POLICEMAN

B. N/A

7. WEATHER

A. CLEAR SPARSELY SCATTERED SMALL CLOUDS

B. 21Z600Z

SURFACE 350DEG 15KT

6,000: 70DEG 30KT

12,000: 350DEG 20KT

18,000: 350DEG 15KT

20,000: LIGHT VAR

220600Z

	SURFACE	270DEG	10KT
6,000:	330DEG	30KT	
12,000:	340DEG	25KT	
16,000:	320DEG	25KT	
22,000:	300DEG	10KT	
30,000:	3000DEG	55KT	
50,000:	270DEG	30KT	

D. CLEAR

D. EXCELLENT

E. SCATTERED ~~CLOUDS~~

F. NONE

G. NONE KNOWN

H. NO ACTION TAKEN

I. 646TH AC & W SQUADRON REPORTED NO KNOWN ACTIVITY IN AREA ON DATES OR TIME OF SIGHTINGS.

J. INTELLIGENCE OFFICER 539TH FIGHTER INTERCEPTOR SQUADRON, OBSERVER CONTACTED (PATROLMAN CASTOR) SEEMED COMPLETELY RELIABLE. PROVISIONAL ANALYSIS - POSSIBLE NAVY P2V NEPTUNE EQUIPPED WITH SEARCHLIGHT OR JET AIRCRAFT IN AFTERBURNER. LAKEHURST WAS NOTIFIED OF SIGHTING 210915Z OBSERVER; NO KNOWN ACTION WAS TAKEN.

K. NONE

121457 MAR RJEPRJR

The Star Vega has been in the position given for centuries as has other astro bodies. The four observers probably saw the same object, possibly under different weather condition, several times and apparently didn't consider it hostile. It seems that since the start of the flying saucer era, stars and planets appear hostile to some people.

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION
ASTROPHYSICAL OBSERVATORY

SECTION OF UPPER ATMOSPHERE STUDIES
IGY OPTICAL SATELLITE TRACKING PROGRAM
60 GARDEN STREET
CAMBRIDGE 38, MASSACHUSETTS

May 23, 1958

Captain George T. Gregory
Hqtrs, Air Technical Intelligence Center
Box 9307
Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio

Dear Captain:

I now have had a chance to look through all the reports you sent, and the one concerning the "satellite-type sighting" from Denver interests me very much and I am giving it the full treatment. It is clear that this could not have been any of the American satellites, not only because of the excessive brightness, but because no American satellite at present could be seen approaching from the northwest at the latitude of Denver. On April 30th there were no known Russian Sputnik's up, but even had there been it is almost inconceivable that objects that bright would escape detection by our Moonwatch teams. This is a corker; so much so, that I wish I had the time and the opportunity to talk with these two officers. It could be that in casual conversation some clue might be obtained which is not apparent in their report.

I had an experience the other night which may bear on this. I had been instructing my young daughter in figuring sidereal time, and we had gone out on the lawn to check our calculations when there came along a sputnik-like object---correct brightness, correct speed, correct color, and I almost stood agast. There was no sound. A few minutes later another such object came through in another direction, and then a few minutes still another. On the third one I was able to detect over ambient noises the sound of jet motors. Lights were not blinking. If the other object had not gone through I might honestly be puzzled to this day as to whether I had seen an unknown satellite. I didn't know that jets ever carried such lights.

It is almost inconceivable two such experienced officers could have made the mistake I had first made, but strange things do happen. In the meantime, I am having this observation checked against all other "unknown sputnik's" that our teams from time to time reported.

As to the other cases, which I am returning (I will return the Denver case very soon), we certainly seem to have a fine bunch of meteor observations--five of them. Two others remain: one, the object that was seen the same time on two nights just before sunrise

(period of morning twilight had already begun). Vega was, as you say, near the point of sighting but it seems to me that it was somewhat higher than 60°. There was of course a very fine spectacular object in the sky at that time but, unfortunately, in the southeastern sky. The planet Venus was at its brightest in the pre-sunrise sky, and I know from past experience how easily it can be mistaken for an unknown object. My only reaction is to question the stated position and to consider the possibility that it was Venus.

The case of the "daylight meteor" is greatly ambiguous. While a daylight fireball cannot be ruled out, I would myself favor the accidental release of some object from an aircraft. However, much hinges on the statement "orange flame". If it really was flaming then it looks as though we must accredit this to a daylight meteor. If the light was simply a bright reflection of sunlight, then we have the other possibility. In either case, there is nothing hostile, and I say to this "insufficient information to be able to distinguish between daylight meteor or object falling from aircraft". I don't think it is worthwhile to pursue this one, although I think if I could talk to the chap a better analysis might be made. It just occurs to me that perhaps the object might have been a burst weather or cosmic ray balloon, with the reflection from the trailing material accounting for the "tail four times the diameter of object". In fact, I think this is a distinct possibility since it occurred in the neighborhood of the municipal airport from which, I suppose, balloons are launched. The time of observation was 4:00 p.m., their time which, I believe, is about the time of such launchings. So, three possibilities: daylight meteor---part of aircraft---bursting balloon. All harmless but, I now tend to prefer the latter.

I am looking forward to visiting you in your new quarters---I hope in early June.

Cheers,

J. Allen Hynek

JAH:lc

Encls.